Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN IOSE DIVISION

LUIS HERNANDEZ and CINDY CALDERON,

Plaintiffs,

v.

THE CITY OF SAN JOSE; THE SAN JOSE POLICE DEPARTMENT ("SJPD"); ERNIE ALCANTAR, individually and in his official capacity as Captain, SJPD; and JAMES WERKEMA, individually and in his official capacity as Lieutenant, SJPD.

Defendants.

Case No. 5:12-cv-02952-HRL

ORDER RE DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS IN LIMINE

Re: Dkt. No. 62

For the reasons discussed at the June 21, 2016 Final Pretrial Conference, the court rules on defendants' motions in limine as follows:

Motion in Limine No. 1 to "Preclude any Evidence of Defendants Ernie Alcantar and James Werkema's Financial Condition" is GRANTED AS UNOPPOSED.

Motion in Limine No. 2 to "Preclude Plaintiffs from Presenting Evidence Regarding any Time-Barred Claims as the Basis for any Liability" is GRANTED; however, plaintiffs may use pre-limitation period events as background evidence in support of their timely claims. Nat'l R.R. Passenger Corp. v. Morgan, 122 S. Ct. 2061, 2072 (2002); RK Ventures, Inc. v. City of Seattle, 307 F.3d 1045, 1062 (9th Cir. 2002).

Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Motion in Limine No. 3 to "Preclude Plaintiffs from Presenting any Evidence or Argument
Regarding a Claim that Cindy Calderon was Retaliated Against for Exercising her Right to Free
Speech" is GRANTED. Calderon essentially makes a de facto request to amend the complaint to
add a new basis for reliefi.e., exactly the same as the one alleged for Hernandez, her co-plaintiff
and friend. It is inconceivable that Calderon's free speech claim would be overlooked by the
attorney drafting the complaint. The only plausible conclusion is that she did not have such a
claim. Moreover, this court is told that in deposition, 1 Calderon testified that her only grievance
was based on the alleged violation of her right to free association:

- So the only reason that you believe that you were being retaliated against in 2008 is because you were friends with Officer Hernandez?
- Yes. And also the structure of their whole testing. There would be no way for me to check what my answers were against what they claim the answers were.

To allow amendment now would open the door for Calderon to testify at trial contrary to what she testified to in deposition. That will not be countenanced by the court.

Motion in Limine No. 4 to "Exclude the Testimony of Plaintiff's Proposed Expert Jennifer Ziegler" is GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART. Ziegler may not offer legal conclusions, speculative or argumentative opinions, or make fact determinations that properly belong to the jury. She may not opine on damages based on time-barred events. However, Ziegler may be permitted to opine in response to appropriate hypothetical questions based on facts supported by the evidence. Fed. R. Evid. 403, 702, 703.

Motion in Limine No. 5 to "Exclude any Evidence or Witnesses Not Produced or Revealed in Response to Discovery Requests" is GRANTED AS UNOPPOSED. It goes without saying that

¹ The quoted portions of Calderon's deposition testimony were read to the court on the record at the pretrial conference.

Case 5:12-cv-02952-HRL Document 70 Filed 06/24/16 Page 3 of 4

United States District Court

neither side will be permitted to present such evidence. Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(c).

SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 24, 2016

HOWARD R LLOYD United States Magistrate Judge

Case 5:12-cv-02952-HRL Document 70 Filed 06/24/16 Page 4 of 4

		1	5:12-cv-02952-HRL Notice has been electronically mailed to:
		2	Ardell Johnson CAO.Main@sanjoseca.gov, leslie.donahue@sanjoseca.gov
		3	Kathryn Jennifer Zoglin Katie.Zoglin@sanjoseca.gov
		4	Nkia Desiree Richardson cao.main@sanjoseca.gov
		5	Paul D Ahn paul.ahn@vta.org, margarita.martinez@vta.org
		6	Thomas Kevin Bourke TallTom2@aol.com, legalassistant@bourkelaw.com,
		7	mazizi@bourkelaw.com
		8	
		9	
	United States District Court Northern District of California	10	
		11	
		12	
		13	
		14	
		15	
		16	
		17	
		18	
		19	
		20	
		21	
		22	
		23	
		24	
		25	
		26	
		27	